DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 219 95 SP 009 853

AUTHOR Dyer, C. James
TITLE Humanistic Competency Training for Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers.
INSTITUTION Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 76
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Objectives; *College Supervisors; *Cooperating Teachers; Human Relations; *Interpersonal Competence; Interpersonal Relationship; Performance Based Teacher Education; Role Perception; Sensitivity Training; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; Student Teaching; Supervisory Training; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS Psychooperation

ABSTRACT

Criteria that emphasize humanistic competencies directly related to the accepted role objectives of the student teaching participants--student teachers, college supervisors, cooperating teachers--are developed and stated. First, the clinical student teaching experience in general is discussed including role perceptions of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor, problems, priorities, and the question of competencies. Next, the student teaching triad is treated by the introduction of a new educational term, "psychooperation." Third, suggestions are made for training in humanistic competencies. The final section offers a brief look at change expectations. (MM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137219

HUMANISTIC COMPETENCY TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

C. James Dyer

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Association of Teacher Educators
1701 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.
and
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

February 1976

SP 009 853

SP009 853

INTRODUCTION

The major concern of this paper is the development and statement of more specific and pertinent criteria which are directly related to the accepted role objectives of the student teaching participants, particularly the college supervisor (CS) and the cooperating teacher (CT). The emphasis in these criteria will be humanistic competencies, and the paper will conclude with suggestions for training to obtain such competencies. In order to address the topic in a full and proper manner, the paper will first discuss the clinical experience in general, including role perceptions of the CT and CS, problems, priorities, and the question of competencies. Next, the paper will deal with the association of the student teaching triad--the student teacher (ST), the CS and the CT--by introducing a new educational term, "psychooperation." The third portion of this paper is devoted to the suggestions for specific training in humanistic competencies for the CT and CS. The final section is a brief look at reasonable change expectations.

It seems appropriate here to isolate and define humanism and human relations as they pertain to the issues in this paper. In the academic context, an appropriate definition of humanism is any view, system, mode of thought, or action in which interest in human welfare is central and in which human interest predominates. Inasmuch as the adoption of such a view would influence the behavior of the adopter, the expressed actions would then be termed human relations. Since the development of the humanistic view relies heavily on basic attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions, it seems appropriate to establish a procedure which will assist the student teaching triad (ST, CT, and CS) in the identification and the enhancement of these desirable characteristics.

The Clearinghouse is funded by the National Institute of Education, in cooperation with the following associations:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Association of Teacher Educators
National Education Association

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to R&D Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the R&D Center for Teacher Education or the National Institute of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

THE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE. 2

THE CURRENT SITUATION. 2

DEFINING THE ROLES 3

Supervisor Selection 4

PROBLEMS 6

PRIORITIES 8

COMPETENCIES 9

TRIADIC PSYCHOOPERATION. 12

CT/ST INTERACTION. 12

CS/ST INTERACTION. 15

CS/CT INTERACTION. 16

RESOURCES, ROUTES, AND REVELATIONS 19

TEACHER SELF AWARENESS 20

TRAINING COMPONENTS. 22

PLAN OF ACTION 23

REASONABLE CHANGE OF ACTION. 28

THE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

THE CURRENT SITUATION

The complexities surrounding the transition from apprentice to professional in the academic arena have been instrumental in spawning a multitude of books, lectures, organizations, conferences, and general publications on the student teaching experience. It would appear, and in fact has often been stated, that there is universal agreement on the value of this particular segment of training to the entire teaching profession. A closer look, however, indicates that this agreement centers more on the necessity for the experience, along with discussions of the problems and the often negative results, rather than an agreement on the specific procedures required to alter the outcomes in a desirable manner. There also seems to be a universal reticence to advocate and put into practice the sweeping changes that are indicated as requisite to a better way of making the experience more productive for all concerned. Does this hesitancy stem from the long-standing attitudes which promote maintenance of the status quo, the obvious demand for increased effort and commitment to the vocation, or the basic fear of an inability to offer something of value for procedures eliminated? Perhaps participation in a profession which deals so directly with human lives and their potential courses raises an ethical issue that tends to subdue experimental procedures.

On the other hand, the products emerging from our schools stand as living proof that teachers who have participated in molding these lives are, in fact, sufficiently qualified. It would follow, then, that the teacher education programs preparing these same teachers were not only satisfactorily conceived and implemented, but in fact responsible and accountable for a job well done. Since the specific issue here is a single part of the total program, it follows that a serious search for problems must be directed toward the clinical experience called student teaching and to the persons involved in that experience. The education of teachers is generally recognized as a cooperative venture among a number of agents and agencies including student teachers, college supervisors and their institutions, cooperating teachers and their parent schools, principals, communities, state departments of education, professional organizations, and others. Within this aggregation, our concerns center on the immediate relationships between the public school and college representatives.

In a 1951 study of off-campus student teaching, Vergil Herrick makes his concluding generalization that "The educational, administrative, and financial relationships and responsibilities of the teacher training institution and the cooperating school systems are variable, complex, important and frequently muddled."[1] In the foreword to the book that quotes Herrick, Don Davies, then Executive Secretary to the National Commission

on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, sets the scene by describing the book's contents as a frontal attack on complacency, slipshod scholarship, administrative expediency, and professional conservatism and provincialism.[2] If, then,the problems are so serious, where do they lie, how are they best identified, and what are some remedial measures that carry the potential for a better future? The advent of innovative educational methods, particularly in teacher education, has increased and emphasized the public school/college interaction through earlier field experience--but without providing the necessary ground rules for "un-muddling" the relationship. Lorene Painter and William Wiener, reporting on an inservice program, comment on this by stating:

> The transition of many teacher training programs to a competency based approach with a variety of in-depth field experiences seems to have widened the gap between departments of education and inservice teachers who are a vital link in implementing experiential components. This lack of articulation about the program goals of the teacher training institution undoubtedly causes much of the current conflict, anxiety and insecurity suffered by many college students and cooperating teachers.[3]

Earlier experiences for the potential teacher with the inservice teachers and pupils of the public schools are heralded by the majority of educators as a much-needed improvement, though this increase in interaction appears to emphasize the recognized problem. Unless specific steps are taken to prepare the participants for a more profitable clinical experience, the anxiety and insecurity identified by Painter and Weiner must continue to sabotage the critical practicum in the student teaching experience.

DEFINING THE ROLES

Oftentimes the use of the terms "role," "playing a role," or "teacher role" carries an implication that is likely to make professional educators uncomfortable. Inherent in the terms are factors that create in the mind of the perceiver a picture of the components of the role-playing scene. Included are the stage, audience, and performer--all of which are quite acceptable in our student teaching area of concern; however, the possibility of a script adds a dimension not so palatable. When the issue of a prepared set of behaviors is raised, particularly if it is prepared by other than the performer, the hue and cry of "I'm an individual!" is heard loudly, clearly, and validly. The difficulty in setting roles rather than objectives lies in the patently undesirable situation in which a certain loss of authenticity is inevitable. This is no less true when the performers are the ST (student teacher), the CT (cooperating teacher), and the CS (college supervisor)--all of whom are predisposed to rather fixed notions of what the

other should be. The columnist Sydney Harris, writing in a North Carolina newspaper, puts it very well in differentiating a teacher's authenticity from his authority:

> A person is either himself or not himself; is either rooted in his existence or is a fabrication; has either found his humanhood or is still playing with masks and roles and status symbols. And nobody is more aware of this difference (although unconsciously) than a child. Only an authentic person can evoke a good response in the core of another person; only person is resonant to person.[4]

An identification of roles relating to members of the academic profession is, then, better stated in specific or suggested objectives than in mold-type job specifications. The major concern of this paper is with the development and statement of more specific and pertinent criteria which are directly related to the accepted role objectives of the student teaching participants. The basic problems that are consistently identified by all concerned appear to evolve from the human interaction process and are definitely not the results of poor materials, dilapidated school buildings, or unwashed pupils. It behooves us, then, to look closely at the oft-tried but not-so-true procedures that are generally used to propel teachers, professors, and students into this too often trying experience. The selection of the student teacher is a pertinent and much-discussed contribution to the ST-CT-CS triad but will not be explored here. An excellent place to start, for those readers who are involved in that selection process, is a recent journal article by Martin Haberman.[5]

Supervisor Selection

The public school supervisor, herein referred to as the CT, often finds him/herself so designated for a number of reasons that seem grossly incongruent with the views of the educators who purport to recognize the importance of the clinical experience. The author's firsthand experience provides ample support for these current modes of CT selection:

1. A sheet of paper is passed for volunteers to sign.
2. The principal "volunteers" as many of his/her teachers as asked for by the college.
3. Teachers are enticed by the added monetary increment for "taking" a ST.
4. Teachers ask for a ST to work as an aide to perform some of the more unpleasant chores.
5. Anyone with two years teaching experience is automatically eligible to be a CT and recommended on that basis.

6. Class A certificate teachers are automatically declared available as CTs by the administration.

7. Teachers volunteer who are interested in pursuing courses at the ST's institution.

8. Teachers who are poor class managers and are looking for problem-solvers request a ST.

There are many other equally questionable techniques for selecting these teachers who assume one of the most important responsibilities in the transformation of another person from student to professional. Many times the demographic factors must be considered and we find geographic location, school student composition, and other humanistically less relevant issues contributing to the identification of CT's. This is not to question the credentialing policies which have evolved in our state departments of education, but all teachers who fit the aforementioned categories may not be competently qualified to participate in the one-to-one teacher training experience with the ST.

A similar situation occurs in the selection or designation of the CS who will work with the other participants in the clinical situation. In the teacher education institution, there is as much academic pressure as in the public school, with too much to be done by too few in too short a time. So it is not surprising to find CSs selected by these means--among others:

1. The instructor who is not yet ready to handle the theory courses;

2. Graduate students assigned to the department to "help out" are designated as CSs;

3. Professors who like a break from classroom routine;

4. College teachers who live in the vicinity of the cooperating schools;

5. Teachers in the department of education who are not carrying enough hours of instruction;

6. Professors who have been "away from the school" too long and need to get reacquainted there.

And so it goes, with mere chance casting persons together into a close-working group with the assumption that they are competent for any element of academic training, no matter how remote it might be from their primary expertise.

PROBLEMS

The author's interviews with student teachers (STs) serve to isolate serious concerns that persist throughout the preservice period that they spend in the cooperating schools. Some of the more important issues they list are: personal nonacceptance by the cooperating teacher (CT), lack of satisfactory communication with all supervisors, confusion surrounding objectives and the related evaluation criteria, classroom jealousy, lack of status in the classroom, unrealistic expectations of the CT, sterile (mechanistic) approach to the classroom situation, and the pressures resulting from the ST-CT-college supervisor (CS) interaction. A National Education Association commission underlines these student-stated problems by stating that: (1) student teaching is the one part of profession preparation without clear-cut lines of responsibility, and (2) a new concept has emerged which includes diagnosis, analysis, and synthesis, and further complicates the clinical situation.6 This, then, creates a situation that invalidates the old view where the master teacher demonstrates and the ST imitates. Though recognizing the master teacher as a humanistic person, such an aping procedure constitutes a mechanistic approach to a totally human operation--actions, interactions, individual differences, attitudes, and behavior all included.

Continued efforts in educational research have succeeded in identifying and isolating many key factors relevant to the clinical experience of student teaching. In reported investigations of methods and research on the position of the ST in the ST-CT-CS triad one sometimes finds allusions to the need for good personal relations between the participants. Too often, however, the assumption is made that "when a student teacher reaches that stage he/she should certainly be able to get along with people," and the student teaching problem solvers move on to the so-called real issues. Many times those involved in the clinical experience perfunctorily discuss the agreed-upon individual differences between the pupils and the classroom procedures needed to promote better human relations among those same students without being aware of the possibility that the entire situation may be headed for failure due to the lack of honest, intentional concern for relations between the perpetrators. Hardly a teacher (preservice or inservice) or professor will fail to agree on the critical importance of the affective component in the educational process, and yet self-examination rarely occurs to these same educators as a desirable exploration--much less a required one. The following list of the major concerns of student teachers indicates that the affective domain of those interacting during the student teaching experience needs to be allocated a higher priority than has been the case heretofore:

1. Being accepted by the CT only as a student;
2. Not being accepted by the CS as a person;
3. Accepting criticism from the CT:
4. Formulating goals satisfactory to the CT;

5. The feeling of not belonging; and

6. Being able to accept the frequent interruptions of the CT.[7]

The anxiety indicated here is centered on factors that are usually considered to be an adjunct to the instructional process, and yet the selection indicates they are primary in the minds of the persons for whom the situation was contrived.

The interaction related to the student teaching experience, under the circumstances briefly described herein, inevitably develop an influential stress factor that has long been overlooked. When recognized as such by investigators and evaluators of the experience, it is often dealt with simply by recommending that the CT "develop a good relationship with the ST" or "set the CS at ease in your classroom." In fact, the increased stress factor constitutes a very real threat to the advantageous experience that has been envisioned as the main goal of student teaching. The CT and the CS, as well as the ST, are in a daily milieu which creates a real personal stress situation that often exceeds the tolerance level of the victims. Hans Selye writes that stress and insufficient relief from stress cause deterioration of physical systems across the board, making the body susceptible to psychosomatic diseases (e.g., ulcers).[8] Since we are immediately concerned with the adequate and competent preparation of the CT and the CS for their designated parts in the interaction experience, optimal performance leading to maximum desirable outcomes can hardly be anticipated without consideration of the mental health factor. The college teachers' "12-15 hours of instruction per week" and the public school teachers' "9 to 3 school day" are often perceived in honest envy by industrial workers. This is hardly a true appraisal, however, and Louis Kaplan indicates the constant emotional pressures teachers and professors experience:

1. Curriculum problems (including teaching sex education, disseminating information on alcohol, tobacco and narcotics, administering tests--all without jeopardizing instruction in the fundamental skills);

2. Dealing with classroom behavior problems;

3. Pressure for professional improvement (including inservice education, workshops, institutes, seminars, PTA meetings, and conferences);

4. Community pressures; and

5. Financial insecurity.[9]

Such stress factors as these as well as others contribute to the mental

attitudes that the CT and CS take to the clinical experience. Although considerable societal attention is being paid to reducing these anxiety-producing factors, concern for improving teacher education necessarily leads to the original procedures in the selection process in an effort to enhance the critical relationships.

Another contributor to the less-than-desirable human relations area is the perceived professional status of both the CT and the CS. For example, a teacher who volunteers to be a CT, for whatever reason, may not be consciously aware that there may be an underlying possessiveness with which he/she views both his/her classroom and status as a school teacher. The threat of encroachment on a private domain by either the CS or ST may develop an anxiety that both inhibits the needed relationship and leads to behaviors which are inconsistent with the goals of student teaching.

It appears, then, that the very human and very individual participants in this all-important six-to-eight-week drama, successful as they may be as public school teachers or as college professors, may actually be less than competent to play their assigned parts in the student teaching experience. Many admirable endeavors have failed miserably because of unsound assumptions that ability in one area can be readily transferred to a related, but fundamentally quite different, situation.

PRIORITIES

The problems that need to be considered relative to the student teaching experience are neither limited to the product of a more competent teacher nor to administrative procedures that will enable us to handle increased field experiences in a more efficient manner. Most important is the inherent mental health and well being of the ST, CT, and the CS. This issue must be approached diagnostically in an effort to insure a successful experience as well as enhancement of the self-assurance and sense of personal worth that constitutes the vitality and effectiveness of those who are committed to helping children learn.

William Schutz, in discussing the productivity of groups, has written:

> The more energy a group expends on interpersonal problems arising from lack of compatibility, the less energy the members have to put into the task at hand; that interpersonal conflict is very often converted into subtle and amazingly nonproductive, obstructive task behavior.[10]

Since the group we are concerned with is basically a triad, maximum energy directed toward task behavior is essential and every effort to minimize incompatibility will serve to maximize the results of the experience. Pritchard has stated that the student teaching experience is the entry experience to the

profession and that in no other profession is the time so short nor is the responsibility placed in the hands of only one person (i.e., the CT)."[11]

With due consideration for the stated concerns of the participants, and given the brief period of time allocated to this most important experience, it appears that a first priority must be the preparation of each individual for his/her role in the student teaching experience by helping him/her understand what he/she brings to the meeting by way of individual attitutdes and personal beliefs. This procedure must be specific, positive, and clearly stated in objectives which the person him/herself can achieve without the threat of embarrassment or loss of a personal sense of security. Human relations operating within, and for the successful completion of, the clinical experience constitute a specific and required application of a designed experience in personal self-awareness. There are ample resources steadily available to those educators (and potential educators) concerned with preparing themselves better for a task which holds great promise for improving not only teacher education programs but the personal effectiveness and self-confidence of all those committed to them.

COMPETENCIES

The primary task now is to boldly identify the requisite competencies for the supervisory programs. The philosophy of competency based education suggests the logical approach called need assessment--that is, asking the question, "Knowing the desired outcomes of the student teaching experience, what does the supervisor need to know how to do in order to produce these outcomes to a maximum degree?"

It is indeed unfortunate that the recommended use of behavioral objectives has led to such confusion relative to the definition of terms, adequacy of expression, hierarchical arrangements, and general taxonomy that many sincere efforts have been thwarted and potentially effective programs scuttled. When an institution begins its search for that elusive template to put over their system and trace in all the necessary lines, it discovers goals, objectives (behavioral, performance, and instructional), behaviors, enablers, competencies, and other terms used in a confusingly interchangeable manner. Since the specific definitions and functional relationships of these terms, valid though they may be, are beyond the scope of this paper, the immediate concern here will be limited to those acts which both the CS and the CT need to be able to perform in a competent manner within the period of the student teaching experience. A list that is recognizably much-less-than-exhaustive would include these:

1. To demonstrate the development of positve rapport with others;

2. To exhibit flexibility in personal behavior patterns;

3. To show a "healthy" pattern of self and self discrepancy measures;[12]

4. To demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of the psychology of personality (including defense mechanisms);

5. To demonstrate skill in group process techniques;

6. To communicate efficiently and effectively, employing verbal and nonverbal techniques;

7. To develop a greater ability to listen, to understand and to be empathetic with other people;

8. To try new behaviors in an interpersonal climate that encourages rather than inhibits change;[13]

9. To demonstrate an understanding of the dynamics of small groups and how they work;

10. To criticize constructively;

11. To recognize and show positive concern for values espoused by persons or groups other than one's own;

12. To perform personal counseling activities when appropriate and required;

13. To operate comfortably as teaching team member;

14. To demonstrate a knowledge of learning theory;

15. To develop the techniques of using interaction analysis in the classroom;

16. To be able to specify appropriate and adequate evaluation for the practicum;

17. To use the skills of resource persons effectively;

18. To write and analyze objectives for learners in the appropriate curriculum area;

19. To conduct micro-teaching sessions and critique the results accurately; and

20. To accept institutional policies and regulations that appear to be in conflict with one's own.

There are numerous other competencies, both closely related to and suggested by these, which would also contribute to the goal structure for a training program for supervisors. Inasmuch as this monograph is primarily concerned with the psychological factors motivating the individuals who precipitate the subject interaction, recommendations will be directed principally toward competencies one through thirteen above.

TRIADIC PSYCHOOPERATION

For the express purpose of describing the association of the ST, CT, and CS, and the psychological implications inherent in the humanistic effort, it seems appropriate to develop the word "psychooperation." The thrust of this paper is basically the investigation of the psychological foundation of human interaction which specifically concern the continued relationship of the three major persons involved in the student teaching experience. Hopefully, factors will emerge which can be incorporated into the procedure preliminary to the experience and their contribution to developing a much-improved professional product brought under appropriate cognizance.

CT/ST INTERACTION

Since our major concern is the development of suitable training for competent supervision, it follows that several relationships must be examined in order to identify the behaviors that merit a concentration of remedial effort. The first of these is the daily relationship between the CT and ST.

Research in this specific area indicates that the prevailing, though very general, attitudes toward the meeting of these two persons are quite positive--though oftentimes inaccurate. Research by Anthony and Louise Seares indicates that the ST has some rather optimistic views prior to the clinical experience which may well be fostered by the respectful attention and positive reference to this area by educators in general. Unfortunately, insufficient provisions for preparation have accompanied this attention, sometimes resulting in relatively uncomfortable relationships. The Soares studied self-perceptions in student teaching and found that the real situation falls far short of the expectations of the ST. The researchers asked 134 STs for three ratings on their potential as prospective teachers: (1) self-concept by the ST, (2) self-rating as the ST thinks the CT sees him/her, and (3) self-rating as the ST thinks the CS sees him/her. These were compared to actual ratings by the CT and CS for the same students. In both cases the professional ratings were significantly lower than the students though they would be.[14] This disparity in personal perceptions (on 72 traits) inevitably comes to light in the close relationship of student teaching and contributes heavily to a less than successful practicum. The fact that both the CTs and CSs rate the STs lower as prospective teachers than the STs themselves does not offer a very promising indoctrination into the academic profession.

Many evaluators of the student teaching experience perceive the CT as a model for the ST, and there is obvious support for this view. Assuming that the CT is a product of an excellent training program, has received inservice education, enjoys good rapport with the students, and welcomes the ST as a co-worker, the teacher-to-be could do worse than initate the

CT's technique. The humanistic view, however, argues that the ST is an individual, has a unique contribution to make to the profession, and must be permitted a fair opportunity to develop into an educator who may strive for similar objective but in a distinctly personal and, therefore, more authentic manner.

The ST has been preparing for a teaching situation for a three or four year period and throughout simulated classroom situtations and micro-teaching has developed an idea of how he/she would "do the job." This mental model might well be incongruent with that of the CT, in which case both become aware of a disparity in teaching behaviors which, in shared situations, creates a barrier to the success of the practicum. It may also confuse the pupils in the classroom. It has always been difficult, if not impossible, to determine when the learning-how-to-do period is completed to the extent that the learner can individually translate it into action. Although actual classroom experiences (e.g. tutoring, assisting the teachers and associate teaching) serve to integrate teaching theory and practice throughout the training period, the final year's experience serves as a culminating demonstration. Selection of the senior year of college for the practice teaching experience, like so many other reference points based on time, is merely an index indicating a point when certain experiences and learning should have been internalized, when a certain degree of maturity should have been achieved, and when a specific vocational philosophy should have been established. As a monitor of the trial period the CT must be aware of these factors and recognize the ST for what the ST is individually when he/she begins this important session. Andrews, writing about the CT, indicates that these professionals have been chosen as CTs on the basis of their certificates, degrees, years of teaching experience, and courses in supervision, with very little thought given to useful specific skills for this important task of supporting and assisting young people in their professional growth.[15] Specific preparation steps can move an excellent classroom teacher to a professional CT level, ready to meet and cope with the student teaching experience comfortably and effectively. It appears that the skill in question may be a knowledge better developed in a psychologically oriented training program than in a series of curriculum methods courses.

The issue of personal security is likely to direct much of the behavior of the person who has his/hers threatened. In her review of literature on the CT, Pritchard[16] cites Larry Leslie's suggestion on matching ST and CT on the basis of cognitive dissonce theory.[17] In this theory, developed by Leon Festinger,[18] human beings are continually placed in a state of mental and emotional disequilibrium as a result of contacts with the real world. Cognitive elements generated by reality need to be brought into a consistent state of perception in order to restore the cognitive balance of the individual. Though these efforts are continual, they are not always successful and the person employing them necessarily develops a tolerance for dissonance. However, when this tolerance level is exceeded, relief is sought in specific behavior. Three primary strategies for bringing these elements into consonance are readily available. They are (1) the individual changes his/her

perception of the environment by adding new information, (2) the individual may minimize and discount the conflict between the dissonant elements so that the entire issue appears less important, or (3) the perceiver may change his/her own behavior, thus altering his/her cognitive elements and bringing them into consonanace with reality. It is this third means that may apply to the ST/CT relationship. Having been made aware of this situation, the more secure CT is in a position to modify his/her behavior to gain consistency with what he/she perceives the new classroom situation (including the ST) to be. Thus, a degree of consonance can be restored without loss of humanistic relations. This would augur well for matching the ST and the CT, but on quite a different basis (i.e. perceptions of the vocation) than heretofore implied.

It is also possible that related issues arising out of the interaction and based on the dissonance theory could tend to positively influence the relationship. Inherent in the student teaching experience are unavoidable conflicts, necessary evaluations, tension-fraught conferences, and criticisms (hopefully constructive) which add an element of unattractiveness to the situation--though the participants are voluntarily committed. Dyer found support for the hypothesis that individuals who voluntarily commit themselves to a membership group, and find the group task unattractive, will tend to reduce dissonance and restore the harmonious balance by increasing their liking for other group members.[19] This could be a psychological motivation for improving the triadic relationship between the CS, the CT, and the ST. Such a theoretical application would necessarily result in a matching technique of a nontraditional nature if in fact, as Pritchard opines, effective matching of any type is really possible.

In this CT/ST interaction there are also others who inadvertently exercise an influence on the psychooperational functioning of the CT. Foremost among these factors are of course, the pupils, followed by the CS, the parents, and the community at large. When things "go wrong" in a classroom during the ST's tenure, there is no stopping the video tape and analyzing the circumstances. Classroom pupils are very human, very alert, and all too aware of the on-trial teacher and of their opportunity to react unpredictably. This makes it difficult for the CT to step out of the "queen bee" role and completely trust the ST to solve a problem situation with the class.

The ever-possible visit from the CS introduces, often at a totally unconscious level, an air of tension in the behavioral motivations of the CT. Parents who have made it clear that they are not keen on having their children taught by "an amateur," and a community that continually alludes to professional accountability from the educators on its payroll, all tend to increase the teacher anxiety level. In addition to the aforementioned stress factors, a CT who is unprepared, or unsuited, for such a load finds him/herself expending more energy to cope with the anxiety than with the teacher training task. One further factor contributing to the undue strain accruing to the function of the CT has to do with the related

responsibilities which are often overlooked in the traditional selection of the ST monitor. After the appointment is made, the CT finds him/herself in the unbargained-for position of compliance with all rules and regulations imposed by his/her school administration while at the same time negotiating conferences, agreements, and evaluation procedures with the training institution of the ST. The continuing mediation tends to maintain an attentional demand on the single public school teacher that cannot be shared by any other participant. Surely, concern for the psychological stress factor in behalf of the selected CT is long overdue--both for the health of the public educator and for the most efficient outcome from the clinical experience.

CS/ST INTERACTION

Shifting our concerns to the representative of the college who is called upon to continue a training supervision over the ST in an alien territory, we become aware of a person who has received even less attention than the CT. Again, Andrews gives an appropriate overview:

> Confusion over the role of the college supervisor of student teaching is scarcely less than that over the work of the cooperating teacher. But in sharp contrast to the extensive literature for the cooperating teacher, writings about the function of the college supervisor have appeared only in the last ten years and the first book is now ready for publication. Again, teaching experience gives no assurance that a person is well qualified as a college supervisor, but training programs for this special function are rare.[20]

Although the CS is not an ever-present member of the practicum triad, the influence of recent past college classroom sessions and simulated teaching experiences continue to be a very real part of the ST and his/her behavior. As the temporary release from the college campus takes place, the CS recognizes a keen sense of responsibility for the impression to be made by the student on the cooperating school. Though a close relationship may have existed on campus, the CS and the ST are now reduced to a one-to-one relationship that has been suddenly transferred to foreign soil. Simulations are past and micro teaching sessions are at an end as both the CS and ST now become painfully aware of the likekihood of embarrassing trial and error scenes, critical conference encounters, and the all-important final evaluation period. Again, referring to the investigation by the Soares,[21] we note a definite lack of mutual expectations in the face of the clinical experience as the CS not only rates the ST significantly lower (on teacher potential) than the ST rates him/herself, but also significantly lower than the ST thought the rating would be. Both of these ratings were 8-plus and 10-plus points lower on a 72 point scale and were significant at the .01 level. Although a certain camaraderie develops between the CS and the ST in the campus experiences, it is quite apparent that they do not share the same

confidence in teaching success for the student. Perhaps this disparity is due to the unasked and unanswered questions that exist for the ST in the college classroom climate. When part of the training for the position of CS includes extensive contact with the STs to be supervised, this problem is likely to diminish.

When the selection, or the training, of the CS has not required some type of recent experience in the public school classroom, the ST fails to develop the necessary trust in the supervisor's theorizing. This problem may not surface on campus, but in the practicum situation it is likely to seriously damage the rapport between the CS and the ST. The potential teacher needs to feel the full support of the CS and, when this is not evident, tension builds. Without specific training, the CS may find it difficult (or, worse, be unaware of the necessity for) abdicating the authoritative role enjoyed at the college and joining the clinical experience as an equal team member.

The academic responsibilities of many who "accidentally" become supervisors for the college teacher program often are limited to procedures which tend to develop good students rather than competent teachers. This has long been a criticism leveled at higher education institutions, but in the teacher training program the results are often observable during student teaching. The professor who is competently prepared for conducting classes cannot be assumed to possess the requisite skills for supervising a ST. Reliance by the CS on a thorough preparation for teaching on the part of the ST often leads to unrealistic expectations in the field. The necessity for adequate training in human relations issues for the preparation of the CS is painfully obvious when he/she is faced with offering constructive criticisms, clarifying goals with the ST, specifying evaluation procedures, and engaging in other close interactions.. Since the ST/CS contact is not daily, close communication can be maintained only through frequent visits, open and realistic discussions, and a thorough indoctrination to the humanistic approach to the dyadic relationship. Stresses previously mentioned hold for the CS as well as the CT, and when the professional operation moves off campus the anxiety is likely to increase.

CS/CT INTERACTION

With consideration of this partnership, we enter the interaction process of two recognized professionals linked by a mutual concern and responsibility for a process accepted as a necessary step in "propagating the species." Once the student teaching experience is begun, the CS loses the close and individualized control over the ST that was experienced in the college classroom. By the same action, the CT enters a claim on the ST by providing a ready-made laboratory which is considered (at least in general) to be his/her own private classroom. The tie that now exists between these two teachers is basically a team membership which, hopefully, will also include the teacher trainee. Based on the reports of dissension, coolness, and sometimes overt

hostility displayed between the CS and the CT, one might feel that Langer and Dweck are too optimistic in their views on the psychology of cooperation:

> It should now be clear that behavior depends very much on the situation. We may be an important part of that situation. By accepting this fact, we then become aware of the large role we play in determining the behavior of any person with whom we interact. Along with this knowledge of our influence comes increased tolerance for the "flaws" we detect in others. How can we blame others for what we are, in part, responsible?[22]

Although interactional disruptions, overt or covert, are apparent to both concerned, it is unlikely (at least without appropriate training) that either will see him/herself as responsible for the other's behavior.

Undoubtedly there are many practicum situations that proceed genially and with the desired results accruing to the ST; however, it is in an effort to further insure this that a psychologically oriented view seems warranted. One might contrast a view of Chaltas[23] that, aside from a few preliminary and insignificant skirmishes, personal adjustments automatically lead into a close and cooperative effort with Andrews' presentation of the current operational problems.[24] The contention in this paper is that previously unexposed (and therefore unplanned-for) psychological causes are primarily responsible for strained relationships in this important experience.

Both written and unwritten rules indicate the necessity for a consensus on objectives and procedures by the CT and the CS without considering the basic, learned professional autonomy which motivates to some degree the behavior of both parties. Once both of these teachers have volunteered--or been volunteered--for the supervisory role, the eventual pairing is pretty much a chance proposition either through the office of the director of student teaching or in an innovative teacher center. Without personal, individualized, and specific training for the respective positions (beyond being competent teachers), these professionals are launched into a confrontation that is supposedly ameliorated by the striving, self-concerned, and sometimes frightened ST. The personal interaction is inevitably and adversely influenced by a lack of necessary information on the part of both persons due to sketchy or nonexistent selection guidelines. The CS may not be familiar with the stages of child development resulting in unrealistic expectations; the CT may not be familiar with innovative teaching techniques advocated by the college; the CS is not likely to know the school policies; the CT may be unfamiliar with college philosophy, and both may be ignorant of the ST's background. Many authors have recommended preliminary meetings, a sort of a social get-together, to resolve the issues which are to govern an eight-to-twelve week experience, but this is hardly a substitute for a training period with objectives directed toward competent supervision from two such different environments. Individually, these participants may not question (at least at the outset) the proficiency of the other in his/her own primary

endeavor, but student teaching supervision puts both in a new arena. Again, taking the psychological view of the motivated behavior of the CS, one might almost ask flippantly if this person fills the role of supervisor, snooper, or salesman. The supervisory role is the assumed objective; however, the necessity for entering the somewhat private domain of the public school (to say nothing of the personal territory of the CT) lends credence to the role of "college private investigator."

Continued assurances that the CS is truly interested in the functions of the ST often fail to erase the protective concerns experienced by the CT on the occasion of invasion by a not-quite-the-same-type fellow educator. Stress factors on the CS run the gamut from the feeling of "walking on eggshells" to an outright fear of entering the school and looking for, or asking for, the information that must evolve from the clinical experience.

Another view engendered by this confrontation is that a salesman (the CS) is at work with the ulterior motive of peddling a new form or method of teaching--and this is no less disquieting to the public school personnel. Although the CT may often, and sincerely, profess a real interest in educational innovations, the importation by the CS of theoretical procedures is viewed with some trepidation. This might additionally effect a changed attitude toward the ST by his/her CT when the student is perceived as the practicing agent of these questionable techniques.

The college representative is also indirectly influenced by stereotyped models of inflexible school teachers with outdated methods and less-than-advanced degree status who need some help. The awareness of the task at hand (i.e., training the ST in the way he/she is to go) cannot effectively erase the ingrained, sometimes unconscious, attitudes and beliefs that permeate the interaction. When threats, guilt feelings, and even hostilities raise the tensional state of the individuals to the anxiety level, it is unreasonable to expect either that the training experience will be optimal or that the desired compatibility between school and college (fostered by their representatives) will be achieved. It is likely that behavioral hiding places are sought and the unconscious, though distinctly human, motivations called defense mechanisms function excessively. Undesirable traits are attributed (projected) to others, regressive behavior becomes apparent, repressions begin to cloud the issues, and rationalizations are employed generously to explain sometimes unreasonable actions to self and others. It is unlikely that experiences similar to the triadic interaction have formed a part of the day-to-day functioning of either the school teacher-turned-CT or college professor-turned-CS.

If, then, we are to avail ourselves of the potential teacher training laboratory with its ready-made facilities and educational scientists so that the new professionals will excel as teachers and as individuals, there must be some specific guidelines adopted for the preparation of the participants.

RESOURCES, ROUTES, AND REVELATIONS

Human relations is, at the same time, both the most commonly observable phenomenon in our social existence and one of the most complex components of daily life to analyze. Films, books, seminars, kits, and tapes on this important issue abound, and yet, while we are up to our necks in materials, we often fail to recognize the need for prescription in the most critical circumstances. It has been suggested that we already have more information and techniques on hand in human relations than we dare to use--or really know how to use. It may be the misidentification of this controversial variable as a manipulable entity that results in the lack of success often encountered in its application. As an elusive concept human relations may be best described or defined as the actual application of some set of attitudes or knowledge to a continuing stream of situational encounters. In the language innovatively adopted by the competency based education movement, the actual relations of humans might be termed a posttest for some type of preliminary or enabling module of experiences. When viewed in this manner, there appears to be a fertile field for the design of a model in planning for the desired experience prior to the student teaching experience.

Educational research refutes the everyday, polite, considerate, and perhaps falsely optimistic, daily conversations concerning this aspect of training new teachers for our nation's schools. Mutual respect, profesional loyalty, and good manners seem to sugar-coat the CT-CS-ST interaction as though such deference will somehow make the practicum all that we want--and need--it to be. More private communication with any of the three interactors, either on a casual or a research basis, indicates a multitude of shortcomings that impair the situation. Some of these weaknesses and progress barriers have been already detailed in this monograph. So, while vast amounts of time and money are expended on curricular reform, administrative overhaul, education building renovation, national testing procedures, and textbook purging, the preparation of the flesh and blood components for specific human relations interaction experiences is overlooked. Perhaps it would be more accurate to recognize that this factor has not, in fact, escaped our view, but rather it has been misjudged as we blithely generalize the training for one position in our education system to related but, under the circumstances, quite different occupational roles. The assumption is made that any good teacher designated as a CT will automatically be competent in helping the ST maintain a wholesome self-image (as some school and state departments suggest). A memorandum from one widely-heralded teacher center states the case well in reporting on a workshop:

> Someone voiced concern that cooperating (supervising) teachers needed special training to work with student teachers. We wholeheartedly agree with this statement. MITEC offers a number of inservice courses specifically designed for supervising teachers. <u>However, we are not</u>

> allowed to require supervising teachers to take these particular inservice programs (underlining mine). The policy of the county is to let each teacher randomly select the inservice course in which he/she will participate.[25]

Although the supervisors in this particular case do actually complete the courses indicated, it is through option rather than requirement. Further evidence of this "permissive exemption" and its results were voiced by John Goodlad speaking at a conference on teacher education at Northwestern University. He said that just as cooperating teachers have little to say about curriculum in teacher education, so the persons who supervise STs are of low status.[26] He further states that usually no one supervises the supervisors and it is relatively easy for him to do his job as quickly and superficially as possible in order to pursue (the extrinsically more important) research. These statements are offered to substantiate the claim of neglect in training or in preparing the primary characters in that most critical and necessary process called student teaching. When three persons form a team and perform before a legally constituted assembly of learners, those individuals need not only to be provided the opportunity but required to demonstrate achievement of specific objectives which humanistically prepare them for the task.

TEACHER SELF AWARENESS

Obtaining the certification credentials for the teaching profession seems to carry with it a magical power which provides the possessor an inner security surpassed only by contract renewal or, perhaps, tenure. It is unquestionably a major accomplishment for one to move from student status to professional person--even at the cost of becoming a member of the establishment--but it does not insure proficiency in all aspects of the profession. All too often this licensing procedure marks the beginning of a new career in which one plans to learn "what it is really like" rather than becoming a milestone in the continuing teacher training program. There is a sense of separate, personal direction (sometimes called professional autonomy) that allows, permits, and even authorizes one to isolate him/herself in a classroom or in a school system by virtue of having been recognized as an individually competent educator. This particular aura descends in the same manner whether the setting is school or college and whether the title is provisional teacher or untenured instructor. At the present time, in the evolution of schools and teaching techniques, one might be distressed to discover that he/she is to become a team member, laboratory assistant, or co-teacher of a special class. This situation is perceived as an unwanted sharing of the control position anticipated. Although thoroughly knowledgeable concerning classroom innovations, the unasked-for partnership implies a sharing of the self--an involvement that the new professional would not have chosen voluntarily. The option for involvement must be removed from the world of educators in general and from the domain of the CT and the CS specifically. Enough

data has accumulated to provide a reasonable diagnosis of the clinical experience and the prescription now needs to include the steps by which involvement will be natural and comfortable for those who choose to commit themselves to the profession. One must also know him/herself well enough to make further commitments (e.g., CT or CS) and know much more about the self that he/she is offering. It was previously indicated that human relations constitute a posttest involving application and we now need to define the preliminary preparation experience.

Humanization of the student teaching experience, in an effort to develop the potential value therein, requires a self-analysis program whereby all the participants can gain an acceptable idea of who he/she is--or is not. Once this type of module is negotiated by the teacher or professor, the application of the individualized interface is eminently more feasible. The first step, then, in the selection process for either the CT or CS position designation or certification is a self-screening opportunity based on a discretely conducted personality inventory. Since each institution has developed its bias on instruments of this type it will be best to list only a few available possibilities for this purpose:

1. California Test of Personality. This is a well-known inventory (poorly entitled a test) developed by Tiegs, Clark and Thorpe in 1941.[27] It provides scores of self-adjustment (divided into self-reliance, sense of personal worth, sense of personal freedom, feeling of belonging, withdrawal tendencies and nervous symptoms). A social adjustment scale is divided into ethical standards, social skills, antisocial tendencies, family relations, school or occupational relations, and community relations. There is also a total adjustment score and a norm-referenced table for interpretation of the resulting profile.

2. The Miskimins Self-Goal-Other Discrepancy Scale (MSGO).[28] This is a self-rating scale using the semantic differntial format to evaluate self-concept. The teacher, in this case, indicates where on a specific dimension he/she thinks he/she is, then where he/she would like to be, and third (on the same dimension), where he/she thinks others perceive him/her to be. This scale can be used both as a pretest and posttest (following a period of experience or instruction) and as a stock-taking personal instrument for self-analysis on fifteen suggested dimensions.

3. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Although this particular instrument is somewhat outdated (last edition 1953) the issues raised, involving classroom

situations and how the test-taker feels about them provides a suitability indication of attitudes toward typical classroom situations. There is also a norm-referenced validation for percentile scoring.

4. Any of several personality schedules, value studies, temperament scales or personality instruments. (The school psychologist or counseling center can suggest appropriate measures and provide specimen data.)

The basic issue in this first step is related more to self-analysis than to the "best fit" question pertaining to educational roles. When one moves through the very personal diagnosis, he/she is infinitely more capable of determining his/her own suitability for continued preparation for the interaction inherent in the CT or CS position. Any one of the above mentioned tests might also be adopted by an institutional selection committee, and a criterion level established as one qualification for continuing the preparation program. In such cases, the option would no longer belong to the individual and any benefits otherwise accruing to the program would not be allowed undue priority in selection procedures. It would certainly be hoped that those who aspire to the CT or the CS designations and are eliminated (or eliminate themselves) at this first step would not fail to profit by the analysis experience. With this as a preliminary to a course of study designed to prepare otherwise qualified educators for the supervisory role, the actual structure of courses, seminars, and other requirements can be considered.

TRAINING COMPONENTS

Robert Howsam, Dean of the College of Education, University of Houston, and affectionately dubbed the "father" of competency based education, in speaking to a conference on that issue, gave some strong and convincing arguments for teacher training programs being college-based and field-oriented rather than field-based. It was his contention that facilities, resources, and related elements were more readily available at the institution of higher learning to sponsor special course programs than at the public school systems. It appears that a program for the preparation of CT and the CS might better be campus-based for similar reasons, though it might also be developed as a regular inservice program if necessary--depending on the clientele. The emphasis in this paper is on content and objectives rather than geographic location and sponsors. Available time for professors, and especially for public school personnel, to engage in extra study courses has always been an understandable problem. Once again, the concern here is with the preparation of competent supervisory persons and, since achieving this goal is considered to be imperative, the adjunct complications involving time, money, tuition, credits, transportation, and management must be dealt with by the system. It is recommended, however, that state

departments of education recognize such programs in their accreditation and renewal policies as well as for certification. There are, notably, a number of states that provide for a Supervior of Student Teacher's Certificate. In some cases, it is merely "on the books" and the qualification requirements are not specifically designated. One state has published requirements for such a certificate (without attendant increment, recognition, or status) and indicates that:

> This is an optional certificate not to be required of supervisors of student teaching until the supply is more adequate. In the meanwhile, the minimum academic and professional qualifications for a supervisor of student teaching shall be a Class "A" Teacher's Certificate and at least two years of successful classroom teaching experience.[29]

One wonders first, what the "short supply" refers to, and then, who judges the success of the classroom teaching? It is likely that this is typical in many states and the new bottles are left empty--waiting for the new wine to be made.

Recognized authors in the personal interaction field indicate with each new publication that human relations cannot be defined adequately and taught effectively. Since it is hardly a collection of factual data to be learned, coded, and utilized to achieve further goals, it must be dealt with as a psychological construct rather than a physical entity and as a resultant rather than casual factor. It would follow that, assuming this to be true, the emphasis for influencing the result should be directed toward training the human relators (as interactors). Further, learning about the self and applying this to the development of more desirable interaction techniques will also enhance teacher-pupil relations. Stradley notes that:

> . . . understanding students is a prerequisite to effective teaching. Being able to teach the how's and why's of gaining this understanding is an essential requirement for a cooperating teacher. If he cannot do this himself, he cannot help his practice teacher gain it. In fact, it can be a neglected aspect of the total experience. The teacher who cannot evaluate himself, who places all learning failure on the student, is practicing the art of misunderstanding.[30]

PLAN OF ACTION

The sequential arrangement and the suggested contents of the following supplementary program are considered to be critical; the allocation of time periods, granting of credit, and choice of professional instruction personnel may vary depending on local availability. Though faculties, facilities, resources, and school populations differ demographically, the elements prescribed below are considered to be pertinent to the optimal development of supervisory personnel from all school and colleges acting in any student treacher experience situation.

The Supervisor Training Program (STP). Adoption of this program would require the appointment of co-directors with the responsibility for coordinating the various phases of the program for the participants and the institutions involved. These directors should be selected so as to equally represent the school and the college, and it would seem that no more than two persons from each system would suffice.

Phase I: Administration of the Personality Inventory (recommended time period: September-October). As mentioned previously, the self-analysis instrument employed should be a standardized type, such as the California Test of Personality, Edwards Personal Preference Test, Kuder Preference Record (personal portion rather than vocational) or other inventory recommended by a counselor, school psychologist, or test specialist. This should be given to all teachers who express a desire to enter the STP which is being conducted for both CT and CS aspirants. Recommendations by principals or department chairman should be optional since some of the volunteers may well be first-year employees and not well known to their immediate superiors. The two-to-three year successful teaching experience often required should be waived since this point marks the entry to a program designed to provide the explicit training appropriate to the supervisory task.

Phase II: Participation in Encountertape Sessions[31] (recommended time period: January-March). It is important to note here that this activity may not include all persons who completed Phase I. There may be those who will eliminate themselves from the program, due to some self-discovery that constitutes sufficient concern in the area of supervision, or those who have been eliminated by the co-directors (local option) based on inventory profiles. The encountertape program consists of a set of ten audio-tape recordings each of which contains the complete, professionally recorded activity directions for the session. Each session has a special learning interaction emphasis and is designed to take one-and-a-half hours (can be cut to one hour when time limits require it). Groups of from eight to ten persons meet for each session and are urged to (1) focus on their here-and-now feelings, (2) emphasize strengths rather than weaknesses, and (3) speak openly about their feelings. Intellectualizing about the experience is discouraged. It is important that the same group of persons meet together for the entire set of ten sessions. It is appropriate, prior to the first session, to administer the aforementioned Miskimins Self- Goal-Other (MSGO) Discrepancy Scale[32] as a pretest to the STP. Results, determined by a pretest-posttest differential, are valuable for the individual participants, program evaluation, and for educational research purposes. In a similar situation, with preservice teachers as subjects, Dyer found that there were highly significant changes, brought about by the Encountertape Program, in areas specifically relevant to the current issue.[33] Changes on all fifteen dimensions of the MSGO were positive with the largest occurring on the tense to relaxed scale and the lack of self-confidence to high self-confidence scale.

Both of these positive differentials for the total group were significant at the .005 level. Since the presence of a professional (other than members of the group) is not only unnecessary but discouraged, there is no reason why these sessions should not be held at both the school and college locations at the convenience of the participants. The tape program cost is about $200 and staggered scheduling of the groups will reduce requirements for the number of tape sets needed. The co-directors should negotiate renewal credit for public school personnel and a reduced teaching load for college personnel participating in the STP and it should include this phase, the encountertape sessions. (At this point, the STP directors should meet with any Phase I and Phase II participants who need advisement relative to their continuance in the program. Opting out without penalty is advisable.)

Phase III: Program Course Requirements (recommended time period: summer session or fall semester immediately following Phase II). This portion of the program is to be campus-based and conducted by regular college faculty. There is no requirement for special offerings unless the number of preservice supervisors warrant it, in which case the responsibility for the necessary arrangements will fall to the STP co-directors. Whenever feasible, it is highly desirable that the courses recommended below be offered in the evening college and enrollment closed to non-STP students. Credit should be given for all who successfully complete the course work and details such as specific meeting times, tuition-free attendance, and other relevant considerations must be negotiated with the sponsoring institution. Courses in Phase III should include <u>one</u> full-time course in the area of personality (e.g., <u>Psychology of Individual Differences</u>, <u>Personality Dynamics</u>, <u>Individual Differences</u>, or others) and <u>one</u> full time course in guidance and counseling (e.g., <u>Group Seminar</u>, <u>Principles of Guidance</u>, <u>Collective Behavior</u>, or others).

Phase IV: Cooperative Planning for Teacher Training (recommended time period: the college semester immediately following completion of Phase III). This element is primarily focused on the curricular, academic, and pedagogical issues that relate to the clinical experience. Among the many topics of concern, the following should certainly be included: evaluation procedures, educational innovations, micro-teaching and other simulation techniques, methods instruction and division of responsibility within the practicum experience. Since this portion of the student teacher program constitutes an emphasis on other than the humanistic training, the content will not be detailed here. Although this component should be structured and organized like the Phase III courses, with credit and load-reduction applying, there are two significant differences. First, there is no single, specific instructor designated. Rather, the seminar-type activity will function with the STP participants forming the nucleus and additional planning assistance obtained, as required, from college methods teachers, program coordinators, and evaluation specialists, as well as counselors, supervisors, and master teachers from the cooperating schools. Other key personnel from both systems may be invited as considered appropriate by the group. Second, this seminar can and should alternate the meeting location both for the convenience of the

members and to take advantage of related resources. As many readers will recognize, Phase IV tends to formalize and incorporate the long recommended, long ignored pre-student teaching conference for the CTs, CSs, and STs--usually under the leadership of the college director of student teaching. A recommendation for such a meeting, made by E. S. Mooney of Teachers College, Columbia, states the concern well:

> The following proposals are suggested for organizing and maintaining a unified teacher-preparation program:
>
> a. That all faculty members of the teacher-education institution, including the faculty of the practice school, meet regularly for the purpose of mutual discussion of the educational philosophy and policies of the institution and of the problems connected with integrating the work of teacher education.[34]

It is a sad commentary on our professed concern for the student teaching experience that Mooney made this comment in 1937--nearly forty years ago! Phase IV is designed to include much more than a get-acquainted meeting in that it provides for the same time and credit allocations as a standard college course, focuses on mutual professional concerns, and enhances the oft-neglected cooperative efforts long identified as crucial to public school/college interaction.

Phase V: Evaluation, Feedback, and Assignment (recommended time period: upon completion of Phases I-IV). This element of the STP is less of an experiential period but, nevertheless, a distinctive part of the whole and not to be overlooked. Basically, there are four components involved:

1. Program evaluation. Briefly, this should include a feedback conference attended by the participating students, course instructors, program assistants, and all personnel who participated in the STP. This conference should be moderated by the co-directors. A desirable procedure might include a written, quantitative evaluation of all program components by the enrollees and general, recorded verbal discussions by predetermined small groups. This feedback should then provide the basis for appropriate program modification. (Readministration of the MSGO at this time will serve the purposes of a posttest as well as provide invaluable program evaluation data.)

2. Supervisor Certification. Public school personnel should now be certified by the state as "Supervisors of Student Teachers" and college faculty designated

as College Supervisors of Student Teaching. This information would become a permanent part of one's official record to subsequently be considered as a personal meritorious achievement.

3. Additional Salary Increment. (This is not to be confused with the current payment--often by the ST himself--that accrues to a teacher who "takes a student teacher.") As recognition for professional self-improvement and increased value accruing to the employing institution, graduates of the STP should be assured of an added salary increment commensurate with their investment of time and effort.

4. Assignment Policy. The co-directors of the program should assume the responsibility for insuring suitable initial assignments for both school and college personnel in accordance with the objectives of the supervisor program.

Institutional adopters of the STP should be cognizant of the performance and competency based aspects of this model and of the necessity for developing appropriate indicators for the implied behaviors. Equal consideration must be given to establishing suitable criterion levels for demonstrating competency. Administrations and state departments of public instruction should also recognize the value of both program support and the recommended certification as a requisite to program success. Educators in every discipline stand to profit immeasurably from the psychological sequelae of such a programmatic endeavor.

The originally stated competencies for supervisors now appear to be an obtainable set of objectives in view of the recommended training program. Increased self knowledge, new perceptions of interpersonal influences, and improved behavioral interpretation techniques are likely to enhance the supervisor's interactions with others in general and with each other (and the ST) in particular.

REASONABLE CHANGE EXPECTATIONS

One does not need to be sick in order to get better. Serious contemplation of this simple statement could develop all the validation one could ever need for the amounts of time, effort, and financial support expended for change. Any interpretation of this proposal, or of similar articles, which would imply a derogation of current ongoing efforts in the field of student teaching would certainly constitute a distortion of intent. There is an inherent self-healing cycle at work, in that educators who are more self-aware, more personally secure, and less anxiety-ridden are precisely the ones who can, and will, continue to examine present professional procedures with an eye toward improvement. Improvement requires change and the requisite process is most unlikely to evolve naturally. Every group of educators, preservice and inservice, must be considered "Ralph Naders of the academic world." Perpetuation of a system or activity that merely "gets the job done" will never exact the maximum potential in the form of outcomes--no matter how stable the process may be.

As long as there are critics, there will be defenders and the criticism will have value only if it is successful in motivating the defenders to do more than simply protect what they have. The near-universal acclaim of the student teaching experience as one of the most important aspects of teacher training underscores the necessity for deep concern for adjudication of its intended goals. The cooperating school, though changing internally, is likely to remain the optimal setting for the apprenticeship of the preservice teacher. In like manner, the curriculum, with some specific additions and deletions, will probably continue to be a relatively permanent part of the experience. If the persons who are individually and collectively responsible for the interaction that makes the activity an adequate experience for the ST continue to be selected, to be assigned, and to function as they have in the past, expectations of improvement are totally unrealistic. It has been well documented that when personal anxiety becomes too great, it exceeds the point at which the individual's energy is directed toward the task at hand and is redirected toward the reduction of the tension resulting from the excessive anxiety state. Teachers often recognize this in their pupils and take, hopefully, steps to reduce the anxiety level in order to permit learning to occur. Most investigations of the student practicum indicate a like situation wherein the main concerns of the participants focus on circumstances evolving from the personal interaction. The STP endeavor outlined herein purports to alter the affective characteristics of the CT and the CS before entry into the critical interaction, by a humanistically oriented preparation technique. Lynch, however, warns us against optimistic expectations in this regard. He says:

> Let us not be deluded into thinking that more and better verbalized knowledge about psychology on the one hand, or extensive field experience on the other, will, per se, result in more insightful perception and greater effectiveness

> in interpersonal relations. The learnings involved are too intricate to permit us to trust simply to more knowledge or to sheer, raw experience in the real situation. Rather, what seems to be needed is carefully guided experience, starting with simple situations, with ample opportunities for trial and correction in practice.[35]

When the supervisor-in-training has an opportunity to examine him/herself and to discover previously repressed attitudes in a relatively private nonpunishing environment, it is reasonable to expect that such knowledge will transfer positively to his/her vocational functions. Additional pressures accruing to the supervisor as a result of an interaction perceived as important create a less productive situation only because the individual is compelled to change his/her objectives in order to handle his/her discomfort. A training sequence as described in this paper can provide ample opportunity for individual coping to take place prior to the clinical experience, or it might therapeutically decrease anxieties so that they do not inhibit task effectiveness. This, in turn, makes psychooperation not only a possibility but a likely and desirable behavior choice.

We have been primarily concerned with the triad of the CT, CS, and ST functioning in a relatively short term experience. Humanistic training also has implications which extend far beyond this. Whether or not the trained supervisors continue working with student teachers, they will likely pursue the educator's role of working with people for some time. The personal growth factors developed in the STP can be expected to continue to augment the teacher's reservoir of coping techniques throughout every human interaction encountered. This implies an important gain for the individual, the system, the society, and certainly for the thousands of students who are immeasurably influenced by educators within, and outside of, the school. Perls feels strongly that all persons need this type of experience and explains his views thusly:

> The average person, having been raised in an atmosphere of splits, has lost his wholeness, his integrity. To come together again, he has to heal the dualism of his person, or his thinking, and of his language. . . . The unitary outlook which can dissolve such a dualistic approach is buried but not destroyed and . . . . can be regained with wholesome advantage.[36]

This formalized effort toward the development of humanistic technicians to improve our educational system holds the potential for progressive actions that extend well beyond the scope of identification in this limited situation.

Immediately and more specifically, change expectations observable as a result of adopting the proposed training program would likely include:

1. A readily apparent reduction in stress factors

within teacher training programs.

2. A long-hoped-for improvement in cooperative relationship between schools and colleges.

3. Improvement in attitude and behavior on the part of school and college faculty who aspire to the supervisory role.

4. An opportunity for student teachers to develop individual, effective teaching styles without the threat of nonconformance with their supervisors.

5. An increased respect for the specially trained and effective CT and CS.

6. The development of a desirable continuity in the teacher training sequence as the ST applies individually learned techniques to an individually developed teaching style in the cooperating school room.

7. An increased individuality and expression of personality in teacher behavior patterns by those who complete the STP and others who are inevitably influenced by it.

The ultimate beneficiaries are legion in a society such as ours where the human relations skills of a single teacher/educator might well influence the subsequent multitude of social interactions that permeate our life patterns. Warren Bennis, Vice President for Academic Development at the State University of New York at Buffalo, indicates the extended influence of humanistic efforts:

> In the next 100 years we're going to be learning mostly about ourselves, and how we relate to each other and to the technology it's taken us 100 years to understand . . . . As social technology evolves and matures, we will learn how to become more aware of ourselves and our impact on other people.[37]

FOOTNOTES

[1] Quoted in L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 51.

[2] Don Davies, "Foreword," in L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching, p. v.

[3] Lorene H. Painter and William K. Wiener, Developing Competent Co-operating Teachers: A Challenge to Teacher Educators (Hickory, North Carolina, 1974), p. 2. ED 098 321. Available in microfiche (MF) and hardcopy (HC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Va.

[4] Sydney Harris, "The Teacher's Art," Durham Morning Herald, October 2, 1975, Sec. 1. p. 4A.

[5] Martin Haberman, "Needed: New Guidelines for Teacher Candidate Selection," Journal of Teacher Education, (Fall 1974), p. 234-35.

[6] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, A New Order in Student Teaching (Washington: National Education Association, 1967), p. 1.

[7] Association for Student Teaching, Mental Health and Teacher Education (Forty-Sixth Yearbook) (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. L. Brown Co., 1967), p. 5.

[8] Hans Selye, The Stress of Life (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 179.

[9] Louis Kaplan, Mental Health and Human Relations in Education (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), pp. 408-11.

[10] W. C. Schutz, "What Makes Groups Productive?" Human Relations 8 (1955), pp. 429-65.

[11] Florence F. Pritchard, "Matching the Student Teacher with the Cooperating Teacher: A Review of the Literature," (1974), p. 3. ED 087 759 MF & HC.

[12] University of Massachusetts, Model Elementary Teacher Education Program. Final Report, Contract No. OEC-0-8-089023-3312 (910). (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 185.

[13] Human Development Institute, Inc., Coordinators Manual: Encountertapes For Personal Growth Groups (Atlanta: Bell and Howell, 1968), p. 5.

[14] Anthony T. Soares and Louise M. Soares, "Self-Perceptions as Affective Dimensions of Student Teaching," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, April 1974). ED 048 100 MF & HC.

[15] L. O. Andrews, "Useful Competencies for the Cooperating Teacher," Association of Teacher Educators Newsletter (March 1974), p. 3.

[16] Pritchard, pp. 10-12.

[17] Larry L. Leslie, "Improving the Student Teaching Experience through Selective Placement," USOE Report #BR-9-H-015 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1969), pp. 6-13.

[18] L. Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1957).

[19] C. James Dyer, "The Effect of Task Attractiveness on Liking for the Group: A Dissonance Analysis" (M. A. Thesis, Duke University, 1962), p. 28.

[20] Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 63.

[21] Soares, Self Perceptions, p. 5.

[22] Ellen J. Langer and Carol S. Dweck, Personal Politics: The Psychology of Making It (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 157.

[23] John H. Chaltas, "Student Teaching: Assignment and Misassignment," Journal of Teacher Education (September 1965), pp. 311-18.

[24] Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 105.

[25] Katy Maddox Memorandum (Unnumbered) to MITEC College and School Administrators, 30 September 1975, Kanawha Valley Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center, Charleston, West Virginia.

[26] John I. Goodlad, "The Clinical Professorship and Clinical Experiences," Innovation in Teacher Education (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1965), p. 27.

[27] E. W. Tiegs, W. W. Clark, and L. P. Thorpe, "The California Test of Personality," Journal of Educational Research, 35, 102-08, 1941.

[28] Published by the Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute, P. O. 2037, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521.

[29] Teaching in North Carolina (Publication Number 357), State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina, pp. 75-6.

[30] William E. Stradley, Supervising Student Teachers (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968), pp. 14-15.

[31] Encountertapes for Personal Growth Groups are published by the Human Development Institute (20 Executive Park West, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia 30329)

[32] Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute.

[33] C. James Dyer, "The Human Relations Component of Teacher Education at North Carolina Central University" (Durham, North Carolina: North Carolina University, 1970).

[34] Edward S. Mooney, Jr., An Analysis of the Supervision of Student Teaching (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937), p. 143.

[35] William W. Lynch, Jr., "Interpersonal Perceptions: A Neglected Aspect of Teaching," Theory Into Practice, Vol. II, No. 2, quoted in L. O. Andrews, Student Teaching, p. 104.

[36] F. Perls, R. E. Hefferline and P. Gorman, Gestalt Therapy (New York: Dell, 1951), quoted in University of Massachusetts, Model Elementary Teacher Education Program. Final Report Project Nol 8-9023, Grant No. OEG-0-8-089023-3812 (910), 1968, p. 90.

[37] Warren G. Bennis, quoted in Jane Howards, Please Touch (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 253.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, L. O. Student Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.

_____. "Useful Competencies for the Cooperating Teacher." Association of Teacher Educators Newsletter VII, No. 4 (March 1974): 3.

Association of Classroom Teachers. "Role of the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program." Report of the Classroom Teachers National Study Conference. Washington: National Education Association, 1970.

Association for Student Teaching. The Supervising Teacher (Thirty-Eighth Yearbook). Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1959.

_____. Mental Health and Teacher Education (Forty-Sixth Yearbook). Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1967.

Behling, Herman E. So . . . You Are Getting a Student Teacher! (A handbook of practical suggestions for cooperating teachers). Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1974.

Bennie, William A. Cooperation for Better Student Teaching. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1966.

Berlyne, Daniel E. "Notes on Intrinsic Motivation and Intrinsic Reward in Relation to Instruction," in Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology, H. F. Clarizio, R. C. Craig, and W. A. Mehrens, eds. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974: 320-329.

Berzon, Betty and Reisel, Jerome. Coordinators Manual: Encountertapes for Personal Growth Groups. Atlanta: Human Development Institute, 1968.

Bradley, R. C. "Clarifying the Supervising Teachers Role." Teachers College Journal (December 1966): 92-94.

Burdin, Joel L. "Education Personnel for the Times." Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1974): 216.

Cohen, Helen V. and Ishler, Richard E. "The Classroom Teacher As a Teacher Educator." In the University of Toledo College of Education, Educational Comment 1972, Joan D. Inglis, ed.: 29-37.

Combs, A. W. and others. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

Crow, Lester and Crow, Alice. Mental Hygiene for Teachers. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Dyer, C. James. "Humanizing Competency Based Education." Association of Teacher Educators News Letter VII No. 5 (May 1974).

_____. "The Effect of Task Attractiveness on Liking for the Group: A Dissonance Analysis." M. A. Thesis, Duke University, 1962.

Ford, Faye. "Public Accords Teachers Better Image than Teachers Do Teachers." North Carolina Association of Educators News Bulletin (November 1973).

Gregory, Thomas B. Encounters with Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Haberman, Martin. "Needed: New Guidelines for Teacher Candidate Selection." Journal of Teacher Education XXV, No. 3 (Fall 1974): 234-235.

Harris, Sydney. "The Teacher's Art," Durham Morning Herald 2 October 1975: 4a.

Howard, Jane. Please Touch. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Hunter, Elizabeth. The Cooperating Teacher at Work. Columbia University: Bureau of Publications, 1962.

Kaplan, Louis. Education and Mental Health. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

_____. Mental Health and Human Relations in Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Kraft, Leonard E. and Casey, John P. Roles in Off-Campus Student Teaching. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1967.

Krumbein, Eliezer, ed. Innovation in Teacher Education. Report of a conference at Northwestern University. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1965.

Kuethe, James L. Personality Traits Related to "Stress Tolerance" as Determinants of Academic Achievement. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University, 1961.

Langer, Ellen J. and Dweck, Carol S. Personal Politics: The Psychology of Making It. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Leslie, Larry L. "Improving the Student Teaching Experience through Selective Placement," USOE Report #BR-9-H-015. Salt Lake City: University of Utah August 1969.

Maddox, Katy. Memorandum (Unnumbered) to MITEC College and School Administrators at Charleston, West Virginia, 30 September 1975.

McAshan, H. H. Writing Behavioral Objectives: A New Approach. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Mooney, Edward S. An Analysis of the Supervision of Student Teaching. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1937.

Muente, Grace. "Let's Be More Selective With Student Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education (Fall 1974): 236-238.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. A New Order in Student Teaching. Washington: National Education Association, 1967.

Neal, Charles D. The Student Teacher at Work. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1959.

Newlove, Beulah W. Manual for Use with Meet Your Cooperating Teacher. Austin: Texas University Press, 1969.

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. A Guide for the Student Teaching Program in North Carolina. Raleigh: Division of Professional Services, 1970.

Painter, Lorene H. and Wiener, William K. Developing Competent Cooperating Teachers: A Challenge to Teacher Educators. Hickory, N. C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 098231, 1974.

Selye, Hans. The Stress of Life. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Shaffer, G. Wilson and Lazarus, Richard S. Fundamental Concepts in Clinical Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952.

Shutz, W. C. "What Makes Groups Productive?" Human Relations 8 (1955): 429-65.

Sillers, Bruce T. and Kniep, William M. "A Program to Improve Student Teacher-Supervisor Communications." ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED 098184, 1973.

Soares, Anthony T. and Soares, Louise M. "Self-Perceptions as Affective Dimensions of Student Teaching." Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, Chicago, Ill., April 1974.

Sorenson, G. "What Is Learned in Practice Teaching?" Journal of Teacher Education (Summer 1967): 173-78.

Stradley, William E. Supervising Student Teachers. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968.

University of Massachusetts. Model Elementary Teacher Education Programs. Final Report Project No. 9-8023, Grant No. OEG-0-8-089023-3312 (910), 1968.

Wolfgramm, Harold F. "Cooperating Teachers Look at Student Teaching." Journal of Secondary Education (January 1966): 9-16.

Yee, Albert H. "Do Cooperating Teachers Influence Attitudes of Student Teachers?" Journal of Educational Psychology (1960): 327-32.